IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

		FTWARE, LTD., an	Israel					
corpo	oration,) Civil Action No	06-369 GMS			
		Plaintiff,) CIVII ACUOII INC	5. 00-307 GIVIS			
		v.)				
a Del COR WEB	aware of PORATE	OMPUTING CORPORT COMPORTION, CYBERO COMPORT CO	GUARD, poration,					
		Defendants	i.	,				
		EPERT E A RE COMPUNE	KANTARA IK MENUA 101 CHANTA	CIAL VEDDICTEO	13 N /5			
				CIAL VERDICT FO	RIVI			
Α.	Finja	an's Patent Infringe	ment Claims Agains	t Defendants				
	Literal Infringement							
	1.	Do you find that F Defendants have li 6,092,194?	injan has proven by a terally infringed any	preponderance of the of the asserted claims of	evidence that of U.S. Patent No.			
		YES	NO	O				
		[If you answered "infringed:	Yes" to Question 1],	please mark the claims	you found to be			
		Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:			
		Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:			
		Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:			
		Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 24:	Claim 25:			
		Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:			
		Claim 30:	Claim 32:	Claim 33:	Claim 34:			
		Claim 35:	Claim 36:	Claim 65:				

2.	Do you find that Fin Defendants have lite 6,804,780?	ijan has proven by a p erally infringed any of	reponderance of the ex f the asserted claims of	vidence that EU.S. Patent No.		
	YES	_ NO_				
	[If you answered "Y infringed:	es" to Question 2], pl	lease mark the claims	you found to be		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:		
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:		
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:		
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 15:	Claim 16:		
	Claim 17:	Claim 18:				
3.			preponderance of the ex f the asserted claims of			
	YES NO					
	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 3], please identify the claims you found to be infringed:					
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 4:	Claim 6:		
	Claim 8:	Claim 9:	Claim 12:	Claim 13:		
	Claim 15:	Claim 16:	Claim 17:	Claim 18:		
	Claim 20:	Claim 21:	Claim 22:	Claim 24:		
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:		
	Claim 31:	Claim 32:	Claim 34:	Claim 35:		

Infringement Under The Doctrine of Equivalents

4.	If you found that Defendants did not literally infringe some or all of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 under Question 1, do you find that Finjan has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants infringed any of those claims under the doctrine of equivalents? [Skip this question if you answered "Yes" and found literal infringement of all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 under Question 1]							
	YES	_ NO)					
	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 4], please mark the claims you found to be infringed:							
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:				
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:				
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:				
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 24:	Claim 25:				
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:				
	Claim 30:	Claim 32:	Claim 33:	Claim 34:				
	Claim 35:	Claim 36:	Claim 65:					
5.	If you found that Defendants did not literally infringe some or all of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780 under Question 2, do you find that Finjan has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants infringed any of those claims under the doctrine of equivalents? [Skip this question if you answered "Yes" and found literal infringement of all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780 under Question 2]							
	YES	NO)					
	[If you answered "infringed:	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 5], please mark the claims you found to be infringed:						
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:				
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:				
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:				
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 15:	Claim 16:				
	Claim 17:	Claim 18:						

6.

6.	If you found that Defendants did not literally infringe some or all of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822 under Question 3, do you find that Finjan has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants infringed any of those claims under the doctrine of equivalents? [Skip this question if you answered "Yes" and found literal infringement of all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822 under Question 3]						
	YES NO						
	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 6], please identify the claims you found to be infringed:						
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 4:	Claim 6:			
	Claim 8:	Claim 9:	Claim 12:	Claim 13:			
	Claim 15:	Claim 16:	Claim 17:	Claim 18:			
	Claim 20:	Claim 21:	Claim 22:	Claim 24:			
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:			
	Claim 31:	Claim 32:	Claim 34:	Claim 35:			
Willfu	l Infringement						
7.	If you answered "Yes infringement willful?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, was Defe	endants'			
	YES		NO				

Defendants' Patent Invalidity Claims Against Finjan B.

Anticipation

8.	Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 are invalid because the are anticipated by prior art?					
	YES	NO				
	[If you answered "Ye anticipated by prior a		ase identify the claims	you found to be		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:		
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:		
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:		
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 24:	Claim 25:		
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:		
	Claim 30:	Claim 32:	Claim 33:	Claim 34:		
	Claim 35:	Claim 36:	Claim 65:			
9.	Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780 are invalid because they are anticipated by prior art?					
	YES					
	[If you answered "Ye anticipated by prior a		ase identify the claims	you found to be		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:		
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:		
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:		
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 15:	Claim 16:		
	Claim 17:	Claim 18:				

10.

10.	Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822 are invalid because they are anticipated by prior art?						
	YES	NO_					
	[If you answered "Ye be anticipated by price		ease identify the claims	s you found to			
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 4:	Claim 6:			
	Claim 8:	Claim 9:	Claim 12:	Claim 13:			
	Claim 15:	Claim 16:	Claim 17:	Claim 18:			
	Claim 20:	Claim 21:	Claim 22:	Claim 24:			
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:			
	Claim 31:	Claim 32:	Claim 34:	Claim 35:			
Obvid	ousness						
11.	Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 are invalid because the prior art makes them obvious?						
	YES	NO_					
	[If you answered "Y be obvious:	es" to Question 11], pl	ease identify the claim	s you found to			
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:			
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:			
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:			
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 24:	Claim 25:			
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:			
	Claim 30:	Claim 32:	Claim 33:	Claim 34:			
	Claim 35:	Claim 36:	Claim 65:				
	and the state of t						

C.

12.		claims of U.S. Patent 1	by clear and convincing No. 6,804,780 are inva			
	YES	NO				
	[If you answered "Y be obvious:	es" to Question 12], _]	please identify the clai	ms you found to		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:		
	Claim 5:	Claim 6:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:		
	Claim 9:	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:		
	Claim 13:	Claim 14:	Claim 15:	Claim 16:		
	Claim 17:	Claim 18:				
13.	Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822 are invalid because the prior art makes them obvious?					
	YES	NO				
	[If you answered "Y be obvious:	es" to Question 13], 1	please identify the clai	ms you found to		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 4:	Claim 6:		
	Claim 8:	Claim 9:	Claim 12:	Claim 13:		
	Claim 15:	Claim 16:	Claim 17:	Claim 18:		
	Claim 20:	Claim 21:	Claim 22:	Claim 24:		
	Claim 26:	Claim 27:	Claim 28:	Claim 29:		
	Claim 31:	Claim 32:	Claim 34:	Claim 35:		
Defer	ndants' Inequitable (Conduct Claim				
14.	•					

E.

D. Dama	iges for	'Finian's	Patent	Infringement	Claims	Against	Defendants
---------	----------	-----------	--------	--------------	--------	---------	------------

15.	If you have found that Defendants have infringed one or more of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194, U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780, and/or U.S. Patent No. 7,058,822, and that those claims are valid, then what is the reasonable royalty rate to which Finjan has proven by a preponderance of the evidence and the amount of sales that the royalty rate should be applied to?					
		% \$				
Secu	re Computing's Pat	ent Infringement C	aims Against Finjan			
Liter	al Infringement					
16.	Do you find that Secure Computing has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Finjan has literally infringed any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,361?					
	YES	N	O			
	[If you answered 'infringed:	'Yes" to Question 16	, please mark the clai	ms you found to be		
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:		
	Claim 5:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:	Claim 9:		
	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:	Claim 14:		
	Claim 15:					
17.			s proven by a prepond ged Claim 37 of U.S. I			
	YES	N	0			

Infringement Under The Doctrine of Equivalents

18.	If you found that Finjan did not literally infringe some or all of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,361 under Question 16, do you find that Secure Computing has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Finjan has infringed any of those claims under the doctrine of equivalents? [Skip this question if you answered "Yes" and found literal infringement of all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,361 under Question 16]				
	YES	NO			
	[If you answered "Ye infringed:	s" to Question 18], plo	ease mark the claims yo	ou found to be	
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:	
	Claim 5:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:	Claim 9:	
	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:	Claim 14:	
	Claim 15:				
19.	6,357,010 under Ques preponderance of the doctrine of equivalent	stion 17, do you find the evidence that Finjan hats? [Skip this question	ringe Claim 37 of U.S. hat Secure Computing has infringed that claim on if you answered "Yeatent No. 6,357,010 upon 15 of 15 o	has proven by a under the es" and found	
	YES	NO			
Willfu	l Infringement of U.S	S. Patent No. 7,185,36	51		
20.	If you answered "Yes	" to Question 16 or 18	3, was Finjan's infringe	ment willful?	
	YES	NO_			
Willfu	l Infringement of U.S	S. Patent No. 6,357,01	0		
21.	If you answered "Yes	s" to Question 17 or 19), was Finjan's infringe	ment willful?	
	YES	NO			

Do you find that Finjan has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of

F. Finjan's Patent Invalidity Claims Against Secure Computing

Anticipation

22.

	the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,361 are invalid because they are anticipated by prior art?						
	YES	NO_	NV/NV/nl for Million in Million i				
	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 22], please mark the claims you found to be anticipated by prior art:						
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:			
	Claim 5:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:	Claim 9:			
	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:	Claim 14:			
	Claim 15:						
23.		an has proven by clea . 6,357,010 is invalid					
	YES	NO_					
Obvio	usness						
24.		an has proven by clea f U.S. Patent No. 7,18 ?					
	YES	NO_	WATER THE PARTY OF				
	[If you answered "Yes" to Question 24], please mark the claims you found to be obvious:						
	Claim 1:	Claim 2:	Claim 3:	Claim 4:			
	Claim 5:	Claim 7:	Claim 8:	Claim 9:			
	Claim 10:	Claim 11:	Claim 12:	Claim 14:			
	Claim 15:						
25.	Do you find that Finj 37 of U.S. Patent No	an has proven by clea . 6,357,010 is invalid	r and convincing evi because the prior art	dence that Claim makes it obvious?			
	YES	NO					

G.	Damages fe	or Secure	Computing'	s Patent	Infringement	Claims A	Against Fin	ian

26.	If you have found that Finjan has infringed one or more of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,361 and that those claims are valid, then what is the reasonable royalty rate to which Secure Computing has proven by a preponderance of the evidence and the amount of sales that the royalty rate should be applied to?
	% \$
27.	If you have found that Finjan has infringed one or more of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,357,010 and that those claims are valid, then what is the reasonable royalty rate to which Secure Computing has proven by a preponderance of the evidence and the amount of sales that the royalty rate should be applied to?
	% \$
FORE	EPERSON

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Philip A. Rovner, hereby certify that on January 7, 2008, the within document was filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following; that the document was served on the following counsel as indicated; and that the document is available for viewing and downloading from CM/ECF.

BY HAND DELIVERY AND E-MAIL

Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esq. Kelly E. Farnan, Esq. Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. One Rodney Square 920 N. King Street Wilmington, DE 19801 cottrell@rlf.com; farnan@rlf.com

I hereby certify that on January 7, 2008 I have sent by E-mail the foregoing document to the following non-registered participants:

Jake M. Holdreith, Esq.
Christopher A. Seidl, Esq.
Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi L.L.P.
2800 LaSalle Plaza
800 LaSalle Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55402
imholdreith@rkmc.com; caseidl@rkmc.com

/s/ Philip A. Rovner

Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 984-6000
E-mail: provner@potteranderson.com